

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 274 851

CE 045 245

AUTHOR Hudzik, John K.; Curry, Theodore H., II
TITLE The MCMI General Findings.
INSTITUTION Michigan Judicial Inst., Lansing.
PUB DATE May 86
NOTE 59p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; *Administrators; Adult Education; *Courts; *Educational Needs; *Job Analysis; Job Skills; *Management Development; Needs Assessment; Occupational Information

IDENTIFIERS *Court Managers; Michigan

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes both the findings obtained from an analysis of managerial jobs in courts and the options that exist for future management training of Michigan court personnel. The first section describes the need for and importance of information about managerial jobs in courts. The next section describes the development of the Michigan Court Management Inventory (MCMI), a research-based, job analysis questionnaire that was subsequently completed by over 60 percent of those who hold administrative positions within Michigan trial courts. The third section presents overall findings from an analysis of the MCMI data. Eight tables provide data on sample characteristics, overall MCMI index results, importance of management functions, top one-third of task items meeting the criterion of importance, comparison of all respondents to the top management subset, comparisons by court type, reliability test results, and items grouped by management function and effectiveness characteristic. The final section offers general conclusions and an overview of the principal implications of these findings for future Michigan Judicial Institute management training programs. Recommendations are made regarding training topics for groups of managers and major training needs. (YLB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED 274 851

THE MCMI GENERAL FINDINGS

John K. Hudzik
Theodore H. Curry II

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

May 1986

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Plog

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Michigan Judicial Institute

CE 045 245

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part I: The MCMI General Findings.....	1
Introduction.....	1
General Background: Why Study Jobs in Courts?.....	1
A Paucity of Existing Information.....	2
Job Information and Identifying Court Employee	3
Developmental Needs	
The Michigan Court Management Inventory: Origins and Design	4
Origins of the MCMI and Outline of the Project.....	5
The Basic Design of the MCMI.....	6
Content and Organization of the MCMI.....	8
Purpose and Use of MCMI Information.....	9
General Findings from the MCMI Sample	10
The Final Sample.....	10
General Findings Based on the Entire Sample.....	10
General Index Findings.....	11
Responses to Individual MCMI Items.....	13
Variations in MCMI Results	
1. Managerial Level.....	14
2. Type of Court.....	15
3. Other Demographic Variables and Interactive Effects.....	15
Some Caveats about the Basic Design of the MCMI	16
Validity and Reliability of MCMI Responses	17
Summary Information for Individual MCMI Items	19
Table 1: Characteristics of the MCMI Sample	20
Table 2: Overall MCMI Index Results	21
Table 3: Importance of Management Functions	22
Table 4: Top One-Third of Task Items Meeting Criterion	22
Table 5: MCMI Results: Comparing All Respondents to the Management Subset.....	27
Table 6: MCMI Results: Comparisons by Court Type	28
Table 7: Reliability Test Results	29

Table 8: Selected Data for MCMI Individual Items: Items Grouped by Management Function and Effectiveness Characteristic.....	30
Part II: The MCMI - Training Implications	45
Overview	45
Findings Revisited and Their Training Implications	46
Managerial Level	46
Top Managers.....	47
New and First Line Managers.....	49
Other Managers.....	49
Major Training Needs	50
Methods of Participant Selection	53
Training Implications and Final Thoughts	53
Final Recommendations for MJI Consideration	54
Bibliography	55

PART I: THE MCMI GENERAL FINDINGS

Introduction

In 1984 the Michigan Judicial Institute began a unique undertaking in the field of court management training by initiating a wide-scale and systematic analysis of managerial jobs in courts. The project began in December of 1984 and ended in June of 1986. This report summarizes both the findings obtained from the project and the options which exist for future management training of Michigan court personnel.

The report is divided into several sections. The first section describes the need for and importance of information about managerial jobs in courts. The next section describes the development of the Michigan Court Management Inventory (MCMI), a research-based, job analysis questionnaire which subsequently was completed by over 60% of those who hold administrative positions within Michigan trial courts. The third section presents overall findings from an analysis of the MCMI data. The last section of this report offers general conclusions and an overview of the principal implications of these findings for future Michigan Judicial Institute management training programs.

General Background: Why Study Jobs in Courts?

A decade ago, most court managers had little if any training in even the rudiments of sound administrative practice. Training opportunities in basic management practice were just beginning to emerge, following an instructional model that had been pioneered by the Institute for Court Management. The model typically consisted of 3 and 4 day seminars, covering introductory topics in planning and goal setting, budgeting, personnel administration and caseload management. The material was presented primarily in a lecture discussion format to participants who nominated themselves for attendance.

Today, these kinds of programs, offered both by national organizations such as the Institute for Court Management and by some strong state-level organizations such as the Michigan Judicial Institute, remain as the principal, and in many cases as the only available form of management-oriented training designed specifically for court administrators.

However, much has changed over the last ten years both with court managers and in the courts themselves. Through the introductory programs noted above, more and more managers in the court system have acquired basic management skills in substantive areas such as supervision, personnel administration, caseload management, budgeting and planning. So, too, over the past decade more and more court managers have either entered the field equipped with professional degrees related to the management sciences, or have acquired these while on the job. And

the courts themselves have become managerially more sophisticated, having adopted numerous advanced technologies such as information automation, as well as implementing more comprehensive management policies such as those associated with employee selection and performance appraisal, budget planning and fiscal monitoring, and those directed toward the key court procedures of jury selection and case processing.

As a result of these changes, another sizeable group of court managers/administrators has emerged over the past decade -- those prepared to undertake more sophisticated management training than that provided by the basic pool of courses devised over a decade ago. To be certain, there remains a fairly large pool of court managers and administrators who will profit from the basic core of management training being continued, but many others require more advance treatment of these and other management issues.

A Paucity of Existing Information

There is little evidence to suggest that jobs in courts have been studied either systematically or with regularity. For example, one comprehensive review of the court management and administrative literature, conducted by David J. Saari (1982), did not list a single title on the topic of the task content of court jobs. Similarly, in a comprehensive annotated bibliography on court unification compiled by Carbon and Berkson (1978) under auspices of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, no empirical study of jobs in courts was noted. Even emergent areas of analysis, such as court job-classification studies which have been undertaken in a few states in connection with administrative unification, usually do not produce complete understandings about job content and task requirements (Stout, 1986). For the most part, these analyses have been directed toward establishing uniform statewide judicial personnel and salary systems rather than, per se, toward garnering a comprehensive understanding of tasks and behaviors associated with various kinds of court jobs.

The absence of comprehensive job-analysis information in the courts is not surprising. First, a strong administrative self-consciousness within the courts is of relatively recent origin--having begun about twenty years ago. Judicial attention to court administrative matters was fueled generally by the birth of LEAA and its attention to developing administrative structures throughout the criminal justice system (Hudzik, 1984). With Law Enforcement Assistance Administration as one catalyst, the movement toward administrative unification of courts not only prompted greater attention to matters of judicial administration generally, but also growth in formal judicial bureaucratic structures (e.g., the establishment of sizeable judicial personnel systems, often independent of state and local personnel systems).

Second, the present configuration of court programming (both in size and complexity) is of relatively recent origin as well, having emerged from the proliferation of court programs over the last ten to fifteen years (e.g., pretrial diversion projects, court-administered alternatives to incarceration, victim/witness assistance) and from changes in the law (e.g., requirements regarding provisions for indigent defense). With growth in programming has come greater administrative

complexity, more administrative problems, and greater awareness of management issues.

Finally, the absence of systematic job analysis in courts can be traced to the complexities and costs associated with job analysis techniques themselves. Most job-analytic techniques have rigorous methodologies associated with them (Sistrunk et al, 1980) and the design and analysis requirements for establishing the validity and reliability of findings can result in very costly projects (as was discovered during the late seventies by several state police officer standards and training councils (NCJRS, 1978) which underwrote job analyses in law enforcement). Most job analytic techniques require a multi-staged effort to uncover valid and reliable information about tasks and behaviors associated with a given job set and many require some combination of extensive interviewing and surveying of job incumbents and knowledgeable experts (Cascio, 1978).

Job Information and Identifying Court Employee Developmental Needs

Valid information about jobs serves many purposes. From a good-management perspective and in order to meet legal requirements, accurate information about jobs is required for valid recruitment, selection, assignment, appraisal, development and compensation of employees. In situations where there is reason to believe that traditional job configurations are undergoing substantial change or are acquiring increased complexity, systematic job analysis is essential to update understandings about these jobs and to assess extant or emergent gaps between the new task requirements of the job and the present capabilities of job incumbents. Because of the kind of changes referenced above which have taken place over the last decade or two in courts, there is ample reason to believe that our traditional understandings of jobs in courts need to be updated with systematically collected information. This may be especially true with regard to managerial positions in courts, most of which did not even formally exist a decade ago. Indeed, within the court system the idea of professional court administrators is apparently of relatively recent origin as indicated in a 1971 law journal article entitled, "Court Administration: The Newest Profession." (Meyer). Under these circumstances of change and uncertainty about the content of managerial positions in courts, the absence of valid job information encourages three training-related problems:

1. Train the wrong people (i.e., we provide management training to people who aren't managers or miss providing it to those who are because we don't know which people actually perform managerial tasks).
2. Provide training to managers but in the wrong skill areas (i.e., although we accurately identify who the managers and supervisors are, we fail to acquire an adequate understanding of the task requirements of their particular managerial positions).
3. Correctly identify the managers and the tasks generally associated with their jobs, but set the wrong priorities (i.e., although training program content matches participants' job tasks, some or all of the program time is spent dealing with tasks that occur infrequently, are not crucial to the job and are already done well by

participants; high priority tasks -- those that occur frequently, are crucial and are not done well -- are not given priority).

When the purpose of collecting job-analytic information is to identify job-incumbent developmental needs and to design training programs, two kinds of job analyses are necessary. One kind is job-oriented, meaning that it focuses on uncovering the specific tasks associated with a job (focused on what is done on the job). A common technique used to collect this kind of information is the Task Inventory or the Task Checklist. The second kind of requisite job analysis information is called employee-oriented, meaning that it focuses on uncovering how a job is done (focused on identifying the skills and abilities necessary to perform job tasks well). Position Analysis Questionnaires (McCormick, et al, 1972) and Functional Job Analysis Scales (Fine and Wiley, 1971) are examples of employee-oriented techniques.

There is general agreement among job-analysis experts that we need to understand both the "what" and the "how" of jobs if we are to design adequate training programs. This is because the relevance of training for participants is enhanced in direct proportion to the degree to which the training focuses on developing skills and abilities needed in the job as well as in direct proportion to the degree to which the training is related to actual tasks associated with the job. The less we know about the actual nature of jobs, the less congruence there is likely to be between the training and the participants' needs.

The lack of verifiable job-related information about administrative work in courts posed only marginal difficulty a decade ago when the basic core of management programs were being designed during the early 1970s. This was because basic needs were comparatively easily inferred from a general knowledge of court organizations and operations and from an understanding of management and administration generally. However, more advanced management needs are not so easily inferred for a specific occupational setting such as the courts, or when potential program participants vary widely in their managerial skill levels. Most importantly, when both the bureaucratic settings of jobs and the technologies adopted by these bureaucracies increase in complexity, the design of advanced or specialty training programs that are congruent with participant needs becomes more dependent on systematically and empirically derived understandings of jobs.

The Michigan Court Management Inventory: Origins and Design

The Michigan Court Management Inventory (MCMI) is the first effort of its kind in the court system to systematically uncover the task and skill content of court managerial and supervisory positions. The Michigan Judicial Institute funded and otherwise supported development and administration of the MCMI so that its next generation of management-related training was rooted in a more systematic understanding of the actual tasks that are crucial for various kinds of managerial positions in Michigan courts.

Origins of the MCMI and Outline of the Project

The overall project consisted of several phases. Beginning in late 1983, staff of the Michigan Judicial Institute (MJi) initiated contact with the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) about the possible use of OPM's Management Excellence Inventory to assess the training and developmental needs of managers and administrators in Michigan courts. The Management Excellence Inventory had been developed by OPM to assess the training and development needs of groups of managers (executives, mid-level managers and supervisors) in the Federal establishment. Dr. Dennis W. Catlin, Executive Director of the Michigan Judicial Institute, had earlier heard about the Inventory and asked that its applicability to Michigan courts be determined.

Following positive response by OPM to these general inquiries, MJi contracted with Professors John K. Hudzik and Theodore H. Curry II of Michigan State University to provide the necessary technical assistance required to adapt the Management Excellence Inventory to the Michigan court environment and to analyze information collected from it. Principal MJi project staff included Deborah M. Plog and Maureen E. Conner.

Between April 1984 and January 1985, the contractors and MJi staff worked to adapt the Management Excellence Inventory (MEI). This included a detailed analysis of MEI questionnaire items to eliminate jargon relevant only to the federal bureaucracy, the rewording of certain MEI items to reflect issues in Michigan Courts, and the development of a substantial set of demographic questions. These demographic questions would be used later to analyze particular groups and subgroups of Michigan court managers. As a part of the redesign process, the MEI was reviewed by a panel of experienced court managers and supervisors who were convened to assess MEI items for clarity and applicability to the job setting of Michigan court managers and supervisors. Their suggestions for changes were incorporated into the revision of the basic MEI instrument, turning that instrument into a draft version of the MCMI. The draft MCMI was pilot tested with two separate groups of Michigan court managers and further changes were made in the MCMI as suggested by results of the pilot tests.

Because of the broad research base of the MEI, the basic MEI survey instrument was kept intact -- most changes did not alter the content of MEI managerial tasks, but rather changes were generally limited to clarifying terms or making them more relevant to court settings and to court managers. This meant that the analysis of MCMI results could validly follow procedures already developed and tested for the MEI. Also, as the MEI had been previously tested many times for its underlying validity and reliability in many occupational settings (in public agencies in particular), minimizing changes also lessened threats to the instrument's basic accuracy in uncovering job-related information.

The final MCMI was mailed to Michigan court managers in April, 1985. Analysis of the results began in June of 1985 and continued through May of 1986. Preliminary reports of findings were presented in September of 1985, a more detailed analysis was completed by mid-October and provided the basis for a new MJi

management training program (a four-day program subsequently offered twice in November and December of 1985, and once for Probate Registers in early 1986). During 1986, special reports of findings were prepared for the position of Probate Register, and for the Wayne County Probate Court, the 36th District Court, the Wayne County Circuit Court and Detroit Recorder's Court.

The Basic Design of the MCMI

Both the MEI and the MCMI are primarily job-oriented instruments, meaning that they focus on measuring the perceptions of job incumbents about which management tasks are necessary for doing their jobs well. Additionally, both the MEI and MCMI seek to uncover job-incumbent perceptions about general skills and abilities needed when performing their job tasks.

The MEI, developed by the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, can be described as a "research based" instrument -- each item in the instrument is derived from lists of tasks and skills identified by panels of managers and supervisors as being important to their jobs. These lists have been fit into a framework of twelve categories of management functions (what managers do) and ten types of effectiveness characteristics (the how of effective management) and subsequently checked against other research findings about managerial positions in a variety of job settings.

The MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS are a composite of what managers at varying levels (and hence to varying degrees) do in their jobs. The MCMI items related to management functions provide job-oriented information. The EFFECTIVENESS CHARACTERISTICS are a composite of what managers say are important to doing the job effectively or well. The MCMI items related to effectiveness characteristics provide employee-oriented information. The twenty-two functions and characteristics are listed and defined below.

Management Functions (The "what" of Management)

1. **EXTERNAL AWARENESS**: Identifying and keeping up-to-date with key external issues and trends (e.g., economic, political, social, technological) likely to affect the court or the work unit.
2. **INTERPRETATION**: Keeping subordinates informed about key court and work-unit policies, priorities, issues, and trends and how these are to be incorporated in work-unit activities.
3. **REPRESENTATION**: Presenting, explaining, selling, and defending the work-unit's activities to a supervisor, others in the court, and/or to persons and groups outside the court.
4. **COORDINATION**: Performing liaison functions and integrating court or work-unit activities with the activities of other courts, organizations, or agencies.

5. **WORK-UNIT PLANNING**: Developing and deciding upon longer-term goals, objectives and priorities; and developing and deciding among alternative courses of action.

6. **WORK-UNIT GUIDANCE**: Converting plans of actions by setting short-term objectives and priorities; scheduling/sequencing activities; and establishing effectiveness and efficiency standards/guidelines.

7. **BUDGETING**: Preparing, justifying and/or administering the budget of the court or the work unit.

8. **MATERIAL-RESOURCE ADMINISTRATION**: Assuring the availability of adequate supplies, equipment, facilities; overseeing procurement/contracting activities, and/or overseeing logistical operations.

9. **PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT**: Projecting the number and types of staff needed by the work unit, interacting with labor unions, and using various personnel management components (e.g., recruitment, selection, promotion, performance, appraisal) in managing the court or the work unit.

10. **SUPERVISION**: Providing day-to-day guidance and oversight of subordinates (e.g., work assignments, consultation, etc.); and actively working to promote and recognize performance.

11. **WORK-UNIT MONITORING**: Keeping up-to-date on the overall status of activities in the court or the work unit, identifying problem areas, and taking corrective actions (e.g., rescheduling, reallocating resources, etc.).

12. **PROGRAM EVALUATION**: Critically assessing the degree to which court and program/project goals are achieved and the overall effectiveness/efficiency of work-unit operations, to identify means for improving work-unit performance.

Effectiveness Characteristics (The "how" of Management)

1. **BROAD PERSPECTIVE**: Taking a broad, long-term view; balancing short and long term considerations.

2. **STRATEGIC VIEW**: Collecting, assessing, and analyzing information for diagnosis, anticipation, and judgment.

3. **ENVIRONMENTAL SENSITIVITY**: Staying aware of the court within its environment with special awareness devoted to importance of non-technical factors.

4. **LEADERSHIP**: Willingness to lead and manage and to accept responsibility, applied at both the individual and the group levels.

5. **FLEXIBILITY**: Openness to new information; behavioral flexibility; tolerance for stress, ambiguity and change, and propensity for innovation.

6. **ACTION ORIENTATION:** Exercising independence and proactivity; calculated risk taking; orientation toward problem solving and toward decisiveness.
7. **RESULTS FOCUS:** Having concern for goal achievement; having tenacity and follow through.
8. **COMMUNICATION:** Speaking, writing, and listening.
9. **INTERPERSONAL SENSITIVITY:** Having self-knowledge and awareness of ones impact on others; sensitivity to the needs, strengths, and weaknesses of others; having facility for negotiation, conflict resolution, and persuasion.
10. **TECHNICAL COMPETENCE:** Having necessary specialized expertise (e.g., engineering, physical science, accounting, social science).

It is important to point out that although the definitions of terms above provide a conceptual understanding of their meaning, the practical meaning (or operational definition) of these terms is determined quite differently in the analysis of MCMI returns. Specifically, each term is actually defined with regard to the MCMI items making it up. For example, "external awareness" is measured by nine MCMI items; findings about external awareness are based on how respondents answered the nine items. Table 8, presented later in this report, can be briefly reviewed to acquire a sense of how MCMI items were grouped, and thus how they also defined the twelve management functions and the ten effectiveness characteristics.

Content and Organization of the MCMI

The MCMI is a self-report instrument, meaning that information about managerial jobs in Michigan courts are provided through the self-assessments of those who hold these jobs. The MCMI survey has four parts.

PART ONE contains 17 questions which ask respondents for basic demographic information about their courts and themselves (e.g., type, location and size of court, number of employees and number directly supervised, respondent's job and managerial experience, current job title and so forth).

PART TWO asks respondents to rate the relative importance of each of the twelve general management functions to their current jobs.

PART THREE contains 132 questions (items) which ask respondents to rate specific tasks in terms of the level of proficiency needed to perform their current jobs effectively (in a range of 0-9, from no proficiency to advanced proficiency needed).

PART FOUR of the MCMI survey repeats the 132 questions from part three. However, part four asks respondents to consider their current level of proficiency in each task. Again, a single response is requested for each task in a range from no proficiency to advanced proficiency held.

In both parts 3 and 4, respondents are asked to weigh several factors simultaneously when rating each of the 132 items. In part 3 respondents are asked to develop a single rating for each of the 132 tasks based on a composite consideration of several factors (required knowledge, complexity, frequency and relevance of the task to the job). In part 4 respondents are asked to develop their responses based on a composite consideration of the present knowledge about and the degree of complexity they can handle when doing the task, and the degree to which they have difficulty performing the task and the degree to which they get positive results when they do perform it.

Purpose and Use of MCMI Information

The underlying purpose of both the MEI and the MCMI is to generate job-specific profiles of management requirements and of strengths and weaknesses vis-a-vis these requirements. This information has value for the Michigan Judicial Institute in three ways. First, it provides an overall view of the content of managerial positions in Michigan courts, showing the relative importance of each of the 22 management functions and effectiveness characteristics and of the 132 specific management tasks that comprise them. This is helpful as MJI sets management-training priorities and seeks to concentrate resources in areas of greatest overall importance to Michigan court managers and administrators.

Second, the demographic information collected in part one of the MCMI allows the Michigan Judicial Institute to identify particular management needs for administrators in certain kinds of courts (circuit, district, probate-juvenile), or in courts of a certain size or location, or by various types of managerial positions (e.g., for court administrators, assistance or supervisors). This helps MJI identify the most relevant and likely participants for its various kinds of management programs, thereby more effectively directing its programs toward those with identifiable developmental needs.

Third, by combining information from parts three and four of the MCMI, the Michigan Judicial Institute can identify the areas of greatest subject-matter need for individual managers and administrators (need being defined as task areas where a manager's perceived proficiency level falls short of that thought to be required for effective job performance). With this kind of information, programs can be individually designed to meet the needs of particular groups of managers and supervisors who have similar developmental needs.

With the administration of the MCMI, we begin to acquire a more complete understanding of the general duties and tasks actually associated with various types of managerial jobs in Michigan courts, and we also begin to acquire a better understanding of the general skills and abilities thought necessary to doing these jobs well. One side benefit of such MCMI information, aside from that to identify high priority management training needs, is that we can assemble task profiles of various kinds of managerial positions in courts throughout Michigan, perhaps eventually leading to an empirically based understanding of both similarities and differences in managerial positions in Michigan courts. For the moment, however, the objective in analyzing MCMI returns is to identifying priority training and

development needs. The next section of this report summarizes overall findings from the MCMI and the following section analyzes implications of these findings for training.

General Findings from the MCMI Sample

Because no master list exists of those holding managerial and supervisory positions in Michigan courts, all circuit, district, and probate/juvenile courts in Michigan were sent letters by MJJ asking them to identify by name and title all persons holding managerial or supervisory positions in their courts (of the 55 circuit courts, 64% responded; of the 108 district courts, 88% responded; and of the 83 probate/juvenile courts, 59% responded to this request).

The Final Sample

A list of 909 individuals holding managerial positions in Michigan courts was formed by this means and sent surveys. The overall response rate was 62.4% (N=567). Response rates for individual types of courts included 61% of district respondents sent surveys, 59% of circuit respondents, and 65% of probate/juvenile respondents. The final sample on which analyses were conducted consisted of the 567 returns. The characteristics of this sample for selected demographic features are presented in Table 1.

Although the sample does not include returns from all those holding administrative positions in Michigan courts, and although the original sample was not drawn randomly from a list of all such managers, the sample is both large and varied, containing broad representation from the various types and sizes of courts in the state. The respondents, too, are a varied group, being from various educational, experience, and job classifications. Given this distribution both of courts and of respondents, the data permits a preliminary examination of how management tasks are similar and how they differ from court to court and from one administrative position to another.

General Findings Based on the Entire Sample

This section of the report is divided into two parts. The first part presents overall findings based on an analysis of all 567 returns. The second part presents findings for subsets of the larger sample; included in this second part are summary findings by type of court (circuit, district, probate/juvenile), by court size, and by respondents' job title. The material in both parts will be presented in largely descriptive fashion; interpretation of the findings and their implications for MJJ training-program development are traced in subsequent sections.

One way to summarize overall findings is by way of an analysis procedure developed by the U.S. Office of Personnel Management to assess various aspects of each of the 22 management functions and effectiveness characteristics. The procedures include calculation of indices of importance, strength, need, and priority. Each of these is briefly defined below:

Importance Index: The importance index is based on a composite of respondent ratings of the significance of each management function to their job and on their estimates of skill levels required for specific tasks associated with each of the 22 management and effectiveness categories. Index values can range from 0 (no importance) to 100 (high importance). Scores typically do not exceed 80 in any occupational classification. **THUS, THE HIGHER THE SIGNIFICANCE AND THE HIGHER THE REQUIRED SKILL LEVEL, THE HIGHER THE IMPORTANCE INDEX SCORE** for each of the 22 categories.

Strength Index: When present skills in a task area exceed job- needed or job-required skill levels, respondents are said to have a strength in that task. The strength index is based on a measurement of the gap of respondents' estimates of required skill levels (from 0 to 9) and their present skill levels (from 0 to 9). The number of respondents with strengths and the proportion of task items for which they show a strength is considered when calculating the index. **HIGHER STRENGTH VALUES AMONG THE 22 MANAGEMENT AND EFFECTIVENESS CATEGORIES INDICATE LARGER NUMBERS OF PEOPLE RECORDING STRENGTHS ACROSS GREATER PROPORTIONS OF TASK ITEMS IN THOSE CATEGORIES.**

Need Index: When present skills in a task area fall short of job-needed or job-required skills levels, respondents are said to have a need in that task. The need index is based on a similar measurement procedure to that of the strength index. **HIGHER NEED VALUES AMONG THE 22 MANAGEMENT AND EFFECTIVENESS CATEGORIES INDICATE LARGER NUMBERS OF PEOPLE SHOWING NEEDS ACROSS GREATER PROPORTIONS OF TASK ITEMS IN THOSE CATEGORIES.**

Priority Index: The priority index is based on a consideration of both the need index and the importance index for each of the 22 management and effectiveness categories. **THE MORE IMPORTANT THE CATEGORY AND THE HIGHER THE DEGREE OF NEED, THE HIGHER THE PRIORITY INDEX.**

General Index Findings

With these definitions in mind, each of the 12 management functions and the 10 effectiveness characteristics were compared across each of the indices. Results are summarized in Table 2. When viewing the index raw scores in Table 2, it should be kept in mind that the various indices are calculated by different methods and, as a result, yield greatly different raw-score values. Notice for example that the priority index scores are in the thousands while the importance index scores are all below 100. As a result, meaningful comparisons of raw scores can be made only within indices, not across them.

Comparing the importance index, the need index and the priority index, there are striking differences in rankings of the 22 management functions and effectiveness characteristics. For example, out of the twelve management functions, budgeting, personnel management, material resource administration, and program

evaluation are ranked 1-4 respectively in the NEED INDEX. However, in the IMPORTANCE INDEX these are ranked 12th, 10th, 11th, and 5th respectively, in the PRIORITY INDEX, they are ranked 20th, 13th, 21st, and 3rd respectively.

INDICES

<u>Function</u>	<u>Importance</u>	<u>Strength</u>	<u>Need</u>	<u>Priority</u>
Budgeting	12	11	1	20
Personnel Management	10	7	2	13
Material Resource Admin.	11	1	3	21
Program Evaluation	5	12	4	3

These differences reflect the different priorities of the indexes themselves: IMPORTANCE measures the job relatedness of tasks, NEED measures tasks requiring training, and PRIORITIES combine the two. MJJ has the option of setting its general training program priorities according to any of these criteria.

When reviewing the overall findings from Table 2, several points should be kept in mind. First, if the overall index ratings reported above are the only criteria used, however, then only very general program priorities can be set. For example, the need index indicates that MJJ should devote training resources to personnel management and program evaluation, but the index alone does not help set specific content or help identify highest priority participants.

Second, ratings of importance, strength, need, and priority are based on respondent's perceptions of their jobs and of their own abilities. There are both advantages and disadvantages to having data so based. A distinct advantage is that the people who actually do the jobs are reporting what they experience.

The disadvantage is that without corroborating information, we cannot tell whether these perceptions are supported by objective data. As a result, the findings can only be taken as suggestive, rather than as constituting proof about the relative task content of court managerial positions. However, if the purpose of the data collection and analysis is exploratory, that is, focused on uncovering employee perceptions of task importance and development needs, then this disadvantage is not too severe. The data are useful for MJJ's purpose of increasing congruence between training program content and the job-related developmental needs of participants.

Third, the summary data displayed in Table 2 are based on average responses of respondents: that is, all responses of all participants (representing a wide array of courts, experience levels, and job positions) were combined to produce the summary findings. Further, index scores for each of the 22 management functions and effectiveness characteristics are based on aggregated responses of the individual task items making up each of the 22 categories: that is, averaged scores for each item are combined with (aggregated) other items making up the category and further averaged.

When raw data are summarized in such a fashion and the results then used for further calculation as is the case above, two consequences usually emerge; one is that differences tend to get masked (variation diminishes). This no doubt accounts for some of the "closeness" of scale scores across the 22 categories. To unmask these differences, it is important to look at the pattern of response for each of the 132 specific task questions separately. This is done in an upcoming section of this report (See Table 8).

Another consequence is that reporting just the aggregated and averaged summary findings, such as done above, will disguise important variations within each category. For example, the importance-index score given to budgeting (28) disguises the fact that budgeting typically only has great importance in upper-level managerial positions. For example, as we report later, the importance index score for budgeting rises from 28 to 43 for the top management sub-group in our sample. Variations across position should also be expected for many of the other 22 management and effectiveness characteristics as well. Indeed, the U.S. Office of Personnel Management has found the following general pattern of variation when administering the MEI in numerous occupational settings (see Table 3).

Responses to Individual MCMI Items

An alternative method for viewing overall findings and for determining specific topics of high utility to respondents is to look beyond findings related to the general indices and at the specific task items which comprise the 22 management and effectiveness characteristics. This is an important supplement to the aggregated level of analysis presented in Table 2 because it helps to uncover some of the detail and variation masked by just reporting indices.

This was done with MCMI results, based on both minimum "importance" and "need" thresholds. Specifically, all 132 MCMI items were ranked based on the number of respondents who first, indicated that the task had a required proficiency in their jobs of at least "6" (a high intermediate proficiency required at minimum), and who second, also had a need gap of at least "3" (required proficiency exceeded present proficiency by a minimum of 3 points on the scale).

Individual tasks with the most respondents meeting these stringent criteria were ranked the highest in priority. In Table 4 the top one-third of the task items (the top 44 of the 132 items) are listed, along with the number of respondents meeting both criteria. As it turned out, items failing to have at least 53 respondents who had a required proficiency of at least a 6 level matched with a gap of at least 3 were not among the top third and are not listed in Table 4.

Variations in MCMI Results:

There are important differences in how some respondents answered and these differences are disguised by a report of the summary findings only. To further examine these differences, analyses were undertaken to determine if responses varied according to managerial level, type of court, size of court and other factors. The results of these analyses are summarized in the short sections following.

1. Managerial Level:

Table 5 presents rankings of the 22 management functions and characteristics, comparing rankings of all respondents to a subset of respondents (the subset being those who hold positions as court administrators, deputy or assistant administrators, and divisional or bureau heads). The side-by-side comparison of results in Table 5 shows some obvious differences in IMPORTANCE scores and in rankings of PRIORITIES, while the rankings for STRENGTH and NEED do not alter at all or generally very little.

One interpretation of the results from Table 5 is that needs (defined as skill gaps) in certain general categories of management functions and effectiveness characteristics exist at all job levels in relatively stable form. What changes when moving from one job level to another is the relative importance of the management area overall to the job. Also, the amount of complexity or level of sophistication at which the need is defined will change from one management level to another.

Another possibility is that while there are "needs" at all managerial levels, the content of the need changes from one managerial level to another. For example, although all managerial levels need personnel-management skills, one could argue that top management confronts a wider and more complex array of policy questions with regard to personal management than does, say, middle-level management. Or, consider budgeting where the scope of policy affected by supervisory, mid, and upper management levels is fundamentally different when it comes to allocating resources among competing programs. At upper management levels allocation decisions affect the very existence of entire program areas, while at mid-management levels, the effects are more tactical or oriented toward making day-to-day adjustments.

The MCMI findings do not directly inform us about the exact nature of such differences from one management level to another. The findings only indicate whether management functions and effectiveness characteristics are generally important in various jobs and whether respondents perceive a developmental need in these task areas. This means that the design of training programs around MCMI results must incorporate additional information secured from experts in the field or from program participants about their jobs -- usually anecdotal or case information about specific events, problems, decisions and activities which provide the day-to-day real life content of their jobs.

With the MCMI, job-specific information is not collected. For example, MCMI results might show that "managing logistic operations" is an important task component of court managerial positions, but unless analysts are familiar with the nature of work in courts, it would be missed that one important "real life" aspect of "managing logistic operations" is "jury management" and "docket management."

Training programs and other developmental efforts can be generally designed around MCMI information, but detailed design of program substance, especially practical applications of general management principles, requires more specific information about the actual nature of work in the job setting. This can be secured

either from participants or from knowledgeable experts (e.g., program planning committees and teaching faculty).

2. Type of Court

A frequently heard comment is that the nature of work varies enough among the three basic types of courts (district, circuit, and probate/juvenile) that the significant management issues, procedures and problems confronted by administrators in these courts will be fundamentally different. If this is true, we would expect variation in MCMI results across court types. Although the MCMI does not measure the actual substantive content of work, we can analyze results to determine if variation exists across the court types when looking at the 22 management functions and effectiveness characteristics. Table 6 compares the three basic court types across these 22 categories, looking at importance-index scores and need and priority rank orders.

There are far more striking similarities than differences in Table 6. For example, rankings of need items are quite similar. Differences in importance ratings are not of substantial proportions either, except that circuit court respondents generally rated the importance levels of the management functions somewhat more highly. However, this is partially explained not by court type but rather by management level; that is, a much higher proportion of circuit court respondents were from upper management ranks than were respondents from other courts. As previously noted, higher management ranks tend to rate the importance levels of the management functions more highly.

In addition to information displayed in the Table 6, further analyses were conducted using cross-tabulation procedures and tests of statistical significance to determine if any apparent association between MCMI results and type of court could be found among the 132 individual task items. Aside from the fact that a slightly lower percentage of respondents from probate courts had identifiable "need gaps" for some individual task items, no overall relationship could be detected.

The conclusion from the present evidence is that "needs" within the broad management functions and effectiveness characteristics do not vary significantly by type of court. In other words, developmental needs are relatively similar across district, circuit and probate/juvenile courts in Michigan.

3. Other Demographic Variables and Interactive Effects

Besides variables of management level and type of court, other variables examined for their abilities to explain or account for variations in MCMI results included: (1) court size (measured by the total number of employees in the respondents' courts), (2) number of persons supervised by respondents, (3) respondents' educational levels, and (4) respondents' length of experience in managerial positions.

Using the variables above, some statistically significant relationships were uncovered, although most of these proved not to be statistically strong ones. And

many of the statistically significant ones reflect obvious relationships. For example, several relationships were found between items dealing with supervision and the number of persons supervised by respondents: As one would guess, those who supervise few or no employees indicate fewer need gaps in personnel management and supervision.

Among all of the demographic variables used in analyses, three produced more significant relationships than the others when cross tabulated against the 132 task items: management level, number of people directly supervised, and educational level. However, there were no uniform patterns detectable in these relationships. For example, there was no evidence of a consistent pattern that more highly educated respondents either had fewer or more need gaps across all the items.

What seems likely is that individual perceptions of importance and need are affected more by the details of the personal work environment than necessarily by factors such as size of operation, type of court, educational background or experience. In a few obvious instances where level of managerial position affects importance (e.g., budgeting) or both importance and need (e.g., supervision and whether anyone is directly supervised), variation in responses is the product of a complex web of factors impacting on the individual.

What can be determined from the present analysis is that judicial managers with particular kinds of developmental needs are not to be found in one type or size of court over another. Also self-selection into training programs, permitting participants from a mix of court types and sizes, makes as much sense as designing management programs for specific courts or homogeneous subsets of participants. This is because individual needs appear to be determined by a complex web of factors not easily identified through typical demographic variables. Self-selection into training programs permits those who perceive both the importance of a particular subject matter and a developmental need to elect participation.

One caveat about the advantage of self-selection is that participants must be able to recognize both the importance of and the need for development in a particular area. This is not always the case. Indeed, there is evidence from MCMI results that perceived need is partially a function of previous training. That is, respondents who have more substantial training backgrounds are also the ones who indicate higher "need" levels. This suggests the possibility that training not only fulfills certain developmental needs, but that it also points out areas for further development. Training acts to create its own further demand.

Some Caveats about the Basic Design of the MCMI

There are disadvantages to asking respondents to form composite answers by simultaneous consideration of several factors (called "holistic judgments"). Chief among these disadvantages is that there is some evidence which suggests that respondent consistency in answering is reduced under holistic methods because respondents become confused and inconsistent when having to weigh too many factors at once (Cornelius and Lyness, 1980). Conversely, there is evidence that the

quality of respondent judgments improves, and hence the quality of information about jobs improves, when overall ratings are "decomposed" into component parts. Decomposed methods would require respondents to weigh each of the 132 MCMI questions separately on each of the factors.

Although the MEI and the MCMI employ a "holistic" judgment format, and thereby probably increase inconsistency in respondent answers, the use of a "decomposed" method would have its own severe problems. For example, if part 3 of the MCMI were to be answered using a decomposed format, respondents would be required to rate each of the 132 items at least four separate times instead of just once. A decomposed format would increase time required to complete the MCMI from an estimated average of 45 minutes to well over three hours. This would greatly reduce survey return rates and also increase respondent fatigue in completing the instrument -- both of these conditions would have posed far greater threats to validity and reliability than those posed by the holistic format. As a result to basic organization of the MCMI was kept similar to that of the MEI and respondents were asked to make holistic judgments.

Another important caveat centers on the accuracy of self perceptions of need. The MCMI relies on respondent self-assessment without corroborating information from colleagues or supervisors. This is a departure from the MEI method of administration where both the respondent and the respondent's immediate supervisor complete a questionnaire about the respondent's job. By this means some corroborating information is secured. It was determined that for several reasons this would not be possible when administering the MCMI. Expense was one limitation. More importantly, an accurate identification of immediate supervisor for all MCMI respondents was not possible.

With any form of job surveying, respondents must be willing to answer honestly and they must have relatively accurate understandings of both their jobs and their individual abilities before training needs can be identified with confidence. Although there is no evidence from an analysis of MCMI returns that respondents as a group systematically misrepresented their jobs or their abilities, it must be assumed that inconsistencies between respondents' self-assessments and assessments of the respondent by supervisors would be found in individual instances. For this reason the greatest utility to MJI of the MCMI findings comes from the aggregate findings rather than from an indepth analysis of individual returns. The analysis of MCMI findings reported in sections following concentrate, therefore, on these aggregate or general findings.

Validity and Reliability of MCMI Responses

When gathering job-task data, inaccuracies may emerge when the individual survey items do not focus on job-specific duties but rather reference general types of job duties, as was the case with the MCMI's 132 task items. In these situations peoples' answers may vary considerably each time they rate a task's importance or need because the job-specific events they think about when answering change from one time to the next. To the extent that "reference events" change and differ, responses differ and "perceptions" become unstable. With any instrument such as

the MCMI it is important to at least test for such changes. Among other things, this means measuring the degree to which the survey items yield relatively consistent answers over time (reliability).

The MCMI was submitted to a reliability test during the pilot-test phase of the project. The test had two phases and involved 53 court managers, administrators and supervisors. The first phase consisted of the administration of a short version of the MCMI. The shortened version contained 30 items randomly selected; respondents rated each of these on both required proficiency and present proficiency. Also, respondents were asked to rate each of the 12 general management functions according to their importance (the same items as those in the second part of the larger MCMI). The short instrument was administered to two groups of MJI program participants, totalling 53 participants. Administration took place during the program; results were collected on the spot and participants were not permitted to keep a copy of their answers. Respondents were not told that they would receive a larger instrument later with these same items imbedded within.

The second phase of the pilot test consisted of an administration of the entire MCMI to the 53 MJI-program participants. All of the items in the short pilot-test instrument were included within the larger instrument, but scattered throughout and not identified as items previously queried. The complete MCMI was mailed to the test group a month after completion of the short version.

With the completion of both pilot-test instruments, it was possible to compare responses in three key areas: (1) ratings of the 12 general management functions, (2) proficiency-required ratings of the 30 randomly selected items, and (3) present-proficiency ratings of the 30 items. Results of these comparisons are shown in Table 7.

Table 7 is composed of three sub-tables, one each for the three reliability comparisons. The first sub-table compares ratings of the twelve management functions, the second compares required proficiency ratings, and the third compares present proficiency ratings. In each sub-table, the numbers reported for each cell are percentages of total paired ratings. For example, in the first sub-table 13% of all responses were in cell 9/9, meaning that in 13% of the cases, management functions were rated a "9" in both administrations of survey.

Zero variance in responses are represented in the diagonal cells 9/9, 8/8, 7/7, etc. As can be seen in all three sub-tables, there is no variance in nearly a third of all paired responses. Also, two-thirds or better of all responses vary no more than a single value (e.g., a rating of 7 given to an item on one survey and a rating of 8 given to that item on the other survey). About 85% of all responses vary no more than 2 values.

If the reliability were perfect, all responses would fall in the diagonal cells (zero variance). However, it is much more reasonable to assume that some variance in responses should be expected because of the somewhat undefined (or loosely defined) nature of the 0-9 response categories on the MCMI. Indeed, variance of only

one or two values in the vast majority of ratings suggests a fairly high degree of reliability in MCMI responses.

One potentially confounding factor with regard to these high reliability levels is that responses gravitate toward the upper levels of the 0-9 scales, reducing overall variations in responses. It is possible that greater variance in responses overall would result in lower reliability levels. But this cannot be determined with present data and present data do show high reliability levels.

Summary Information for Individual MCMI Items

Table 8 provides an item-by-item comparison of responses for each of the 132 task items that comprised the heart of the MCMI. The 132 MCMI items are arranged according to the 12 management functions and 10 effectiveness characteristics that each measures. In a few instances, individual MCMI items appear more than once because the item simultaneously measures (or fits into) more than one of the 22 management and effectiveness categories. Numbers appearing on the far left hand side of each MCMI item correspond to the order in which the items appeared on the questionnaire.

Four numbers are listed for each of the 132 items. The first number (MEDIAN REQUIRED) is the median answer of all respondents about the level of skill required by their jobs (rated from 0 = none to 9 = advanced) for this task item. The second number (MEDIAN SKILL) is the median answer of all respondents about their current skill level for this task item. The third number (PERCENT WITH NEED OF 1 OR MORE) is the percentage of respondents having a need-gap of one or more between required skill level and current skill level. The fourth number (PERCENT WITH NEED OF 2 OR MORE) is the percentage of respondents with a need-gap of 2 or more.

Although the N varies somewhat from item to item, the results reported in Table 8 are based on an analysis of all 567 respondents. When subsets of respondents are analyzed separately (e.g., top managers separate from supervisors), differences in median rankings and in percentages of respondents with identified need-gaps vary item-by-item just as they do when examining index scores (e.g., as in Table 2). These group variations are not shown in Table 8; however, the differences are similar to the group differences in index scores discussed earlier in this report.

Table 1
 Characteristics of the MCFI Sample
 (N = 567)

<u>Court Type</u>		<u>Number of Judges in Respondent's Court</u>		<u>Experience in: Current Position</u>	
District	45.6%	1 Judge	27%	Less than 1 year	11.8%
Circuit	19.4%	2 Judges	21.2%	1 - 2 years	8.8%
Prob/Juv	34.9%	3 - 5 Judges	29.6%	2 - 4 years	18.5%
		6 - 10 Judges	3.9%	4 - 8 years	26.8%
		11+ Judges	18.3%	8+ years	34.0%
<u>Total Management Experience</u>			<u>Formal Education Completed</u>		
0 - 3 years		9.3%	High School		37.0%
3 - 6 years		14.6%	2 years college		15.2%
6 - 9 years		15.1%	Baccalaureate		14.2%
9 - 12 years		13.7%	1 year grad. sch.		6.5%
12+ years		47.3%	2+ yrs. grad. sch.		26.7%
<u>Total Employees In Resps. Courts</u>		<u>Total Employees Supervised by Res.</u>		<u>Current Job Title</u>	
1 - 5	8.4%	None	12.2%	Court Administrator	20.1%
6 - 10	10.2%	1 - 5	40.7%	Deputy Administrator	7.2%
11 - 25	20.8%	6 - 10	25.3%	Divisional Administr.	30.5%
26 - 50	18.7%	11 - 15	11.0%	Mgr. Support Function	7.0%
51 - 75	9.5%	16 - 20	4.1%	Line Supervisor	22.4%
76 - 100	2.9%	Over 21	6.4%	Admin/Special Asst.	5.9%
Over 100	29.4%			Other	7.0%

Table 2
Overall MCMI Index Results
Based on an Aggregate of All Respondents
(N = 567)

<u>Management Functions</u>	<u>Importance Index</u>	<u>Strength Index</u>	<u>Need Index</u>	<u>Priority Index</u>
External Awareness	40 (9)	277 (10)@	312 (6)@	1277 (16)*
Interpretation	58 (1)	311 (5)	170 (12)	991 (22)
Representation	44 (6)	302 (6)	276 (9)	1223 (19)
Coordination	44 (6)	318 (2)	286 (8)	1280 (15)
Work Unit Planning	44 (6)	291 (8)	316 (5)	1419 (10)
Work Unit Guidance	52 (4)	315 (3)	266 (10)	1402 (11)
Budgeting	28 (12)	266 (11)	395 (1)	1122 (20)
Material Resources Admin.	32 (11)	354 (1)	332 (3)	1097 (21)
Personnel Management	37 (10)	300 (7)	366 (2)	1366 (13)
Supervision	56 (2)	314 (4)	243 (11)	1382 (12)
Work Unit Monitoring	54 (3)	290 (9)	305 (7)	1678 (2)
Program Evaluation	50 (5)	206 (12)	323 (4)	1639 (3)

<u>Effectiveness Characteristics</u>	<u>Importance Index</u>	<u>Strength Index</u>	<u>Need Index</u>	<u>Index All Resp.</u>
Broad Perspective	52 (4)	228 (5)	241 (10)	1272 (18)
Strategic View	49 (7)	253 (2)	317 (2)	1579 (4)
Environmental Sensitivity	49 (7)	249 (3)	259 (8)	1288 (14)
Leadership	50 (5)	287 (1)	251 (9)	1273 (17)
Flexibility	55 (1)	203 (8)	265 (6)	1461 (9)
Action Orientation	55 (1)	167 (9)	264 (7)	1471 (8)
Results Focus	50 (5)	205 (7)	296 (4)	1506 (6)
Communication	54 (3)	161 (10)	272 (5)	1471 (7)
Interpersonal Sensitivity	49 (7)	207 (6)	393 (1)	1954 (1)
Technical Competence	49 (7)	235 (4)	316 (3)	1574 (5)

@ Item Rank within either the management or the effectiveness categories.

* Overall rank across all 22 management and effectiveness categories.

Table 3
Importance of Management Functions

<u>Management Function</u>	<u>Top Management</u>	<u>Middle-level Managers</u>	<u>Supervisors</u>
External Awareness	High @	Moderate	Low
Interpretation	High	Moderate	Low
Representation	High	Moderate	Low
Coordination	High	High	Moderate
Work Unit Planning	High	High	Moderate
Work Unit Guidance	High	High	High
Budgeting	High	Moderate	Low
Material Resource Admin.	High	Moderate	Low
Personnel Management	High	High	High
Supervision	High	High	High
Work Unit Monitoring	High	High	High
Program Evaluation	High	High	Moderate

@ These are relative rather than absolute ratings.

Table 4
Top One-Third of Task Items Meeting Criterion
(Criterion is the number of respondents rating the item
at least a 6 on importance and indicating a minimum gap of 3)
(N=567)

<u>MCMI Categories and Items</u>	<u>Item Rank</u>	<u>Number of Respondents Within Criteria</u>
<u>External Awareness</u> (3 items of 9)		
59. Keep up-to-date with technological changes that may affect work unit.	36	55
60. Keep up-to-date with Michigan Supreme Court priorities and rules.	8	72
124. Monitor proposed changes in state legislation that may affect the court or the work unit.	25	58

Representation (2 items of 8)

51.	Persuade individuals outside the court to "buy into" a desired course of action.	40	53
117.	Negotiate personally or help to set the parameters for negotiation of court collective bargaining agreements.	10	70

Coordination (1 item of 7)

130.	Coordinate with technical staff on the uses of automated information systems in the work unit.	4	81
------	--	---	----

Work Unit Planning (2 items of 9)

6.	Assess the technical feasibility of alternative courses of action.	30	56
123.	Plan and analyze the costs of new programs or alterations to existing programs of the work unit.	22	60

Work Unit Guidance (1 item of 7)

14.	Provide specific guidance on how goal accomplishment is to be measured.	24	59
-----	---	----	----

Budgeting (9 items of 10)

15.	Prepare or provide input into the work unit's annual budget request.	7	74
16.	Project long-term financial resource requirements of work unit.	19	63
17.	Explain and justify work unit budget requests orally or in writing.	28	56
18.	Apply an understanding of the budget review and justification process in interacting with city, county, or state budget units.	17	64
120.	Forecast revenues for the court or the work unit.	37	53

121.	Forecast costs of court or work unit programs and services.	38	53
122.	Justify the work unit budget request to city or county budget analysts, or during budget hearings.	39	53
123.	Plan and analyze the costs of new programs or alterations to existing programs of the work unit.	22	60
128.	Propose ways of cutting costs or set priorities for making budget cuts.	25	58

Material Resource Administration (1 item of 6)

129.	Implement automated information systems in the court.	1	86
------	---	---	----

Personnel Management (5 items of 12)

30.	Develop performance standards and conduct performance appraisals.	12	67
31.	Take corrective or disciplinary actions with subordinates as necessary.	5	76
116.	Conduct grievance investigations and write responses to grievances.	9	70
118.	Evaluate jobs in terms of their worth for purposes of determining levels of pay.	20	61
127.	Fire and layoff employees.	2	84

Work Unit Monitoring (3 items of 9)

69.	Set up and use formal systems for monitoring work progress.	31	56
119.	Maintain a security plan for court employees, records and contacts.	28	57
124.	Monitor proposed changes in state legislation that may affect the court or the work unit.	32	56

Program Evaluation (3 items of 6)

73.	Critically and realistically assess the overall effectiveness of the work unit.	40	53
74.	Identify ways for improving work unit cost-effectiveness.	27	58
77.	Use information from formal program evaluations to assess and improve work unit operations.	40	53

Strategic View (5 items of 10)

104.	Recognize discrepancies, deficiencies, and inconsistencies in various types of information.	16	64
105.	Recognize the essential elements of a problem in a timely manner.	40	53
106.	Apply systematic problem solving techniques in determining the most appropriate course of action.	40	53
109.	Use output from quantitative data analysis in decision making.	40	53
114.	Know when to take action and when to "bide time".	34	55

Environmental Sensitivity (1 item of 5)

114.	Know when to take action and when to "bide time".	34	55
------	---	----	----

Leadership (1 item of 6)

113.	Make tough or unpopular decisions.	14	67
------	------------------------------------	----	----

Flexibility (1 item of 6)

92.	Handle job pressures and stress.	18	63
-----	----------------------------------	----	----

Action Orientation (1 item of 6)

95.	Manage own time efficiently.	11	68
-----	------------------------------	----	----

Results Focus (1 item of 5)

- | | | |
|--|----|----|
| 89. Work persistently toward a goal despite opposition, distractions and setbacks. | 40 | 53 |
|--|----|----|

Communication (2 items of 3)

- | | | |
|---|----|----|
| 79. Present ideas clearly and persuasively in oral presentations. | 13 | 67 |
| 80. Present ideas clearly and persuasively in writing. | 35 | 55 |

Interpersonal Sensitivity (8 items of 10)

- | | | |
|---|----|----|
| 51. Persuade individuals outside the court to "buy into" a desired course of action. | 40 | 53 |
| 83. Provide negative feedback in a constructive manner. | 6 | 75 |
| 84. Accurately assess the capabilities, limitations, and needs of others. | 21 | 61 |
| 85. Resolve conflict situations through informal discussions or counseling. | 32 | 56 |
| 86. Realistically assess own strengths, weaknesses, and impact on others. | 15 | 65 |
| 88. Accept and make productive use of criticism. | 24 | 59 |
| 103. Resolve conflicts or differences of opinion among judges in your court about how the court or the work unit should function. | 3 | 82 |
| 117. Negotiate personally or help to set the parameters for negotiation of court collective bargaining agreements. | 9 | 70 |

Table 5
MCMC Results:
Comparing All Respondents to the Top Management Subset

Management Functions	Importance Index ALL TOP		Strength Index ALL TOP		Need Index ALL TOP		Priority Index ALL TOP	
External Awareness	40	47	10@	8@	6@	6@	16*	20*
Interpretation	58	61	5	3	12	12	22	22
Representation	44	50	6	8	9	9	19	21
Coordination	44	51	2	4	8	8	15	16
Work Unit Planning	44	52	8	10	5	5	10	11
Work Unit Guidance	52	56	3	6	10	10	11	13
Budgeting	28	43	11	11	1	1	20	5
Material Resources	32	42	1	1	3	3	21	17
Admin.								
Personnel Management	37	48	7	7	2	2	13	4
Supervision	56	58	4	2	11	11	12	14
Work Unit Monitoring	54	59	9	5	7	7	2	9
Program Evaluation	50	58	12	12	4	4	3	2
Effectiveness Characteristics	Importance Index ALL TOP		Strength Index ALL TOP		Need Index ALL TOP		Priority Index ALL TOP	
Broad Perspective	52	58	5@	5@	10@	10@	18*	15*
Strategic View	49	55	2	3	2	2	4	3
Environmental Sensitivity	49	55	3	4	8	8	14	18
Leadership	50	55	1	1	9	9	17	19
Flexibility	55	60	8	8	6	7	9	10
Action Orientation	55	60	9	9	7	6	8	7
Results Focus	50	56	7	6	4	3	6	6
Communication	54	60	10	10	5	4	7	8
Interpersonal Sensitivity	49	55	6	6	1	1	1	1
Technical Competence	49	55	4	2	3	4	5	12

@ Item Rank within either the management or the effectiveness categories.

* Overall rank across all 22 management and effectiveness categories.

Table 6
MCCI Results:
Comparisons by Court Type

Mangement Functions	District Cts.			Circuit Cts.			Prob/Juv Cts.		
	<u>Imp</u>	<u>Need</u>	<u>Prior</u>	<u>Imp</u>	<u>Need</u>	<u>Prior</u>	<u>Imp</u>	<u>Need</u>	<u>Prior</u>
External Awareness	38	3	13	48	8	16	41	7	19
Interpretation	57	12	21	57	12	22	57	12	22
Representation	41	8	17	50	7	12	47	11	20
Coordination	40	9	19	56	9	10	46	8	12
Work Unit Planning	41	7	15	53	4	7	45	5	9
Work Unit Guidance	50	10	11	61	4	3	52	10	14
Budgeting	25	2	22	36	1	11	29	1	16
Material Resources	33	4	20	40	10	20	29	2	21
Admin.									
Personnel Mgt.	36	1	9	34	2	19	37	3	15
Supervision	56	11	13	48	6	18	38	9	14
Work Unit Monitor.	53	6	2	61	11	2	55	6	3
Program Evaluation	47	5	5	57	4	5	51	4	2

Effectiveness Characteristics

Broad Perspective	50	9	12	57	10	21	52	10	18
Strategic View	48	2	3	53	4	9	50	2	5
Environ. Sensitivity	46	8	16	53	8	17	50	9	17
Leadership	50	10	18	52	5	13	51	6	13
Flexibility	48	5	6	59	6	8	56	8	11
Action Orientation	52	7	8	59	9	14	56	5	7
Results Focus	53	4	7	54	7	15	51	3	6
Communication	48	6	10	57	3	6	57	7	8
Interper. Sensitivity	50	1	1	53	1	1	50	1	1
Technical Compet.	47	3	4	55	2	4	50	4	10

Table 7
Reliability-Test Results

Twelve Management Functions - Pilot Phase Two (12 Items)

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	-	-	-	.3	.1	-	-	-	.5	0
1	-	.1@	.1	-	.1	-	-	-	-	-
2	-	.5	.3	.1	.6	.3	.3	.5	-	-
3	-	.1	.1	.3	.5	.6	.3	.5	-	.1
4	-	.3	.6	.5	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	.3	.6
5	-	-	.1	.5	1.9	1.0	1.8	1.9	.6	1.1
6	-	.1	-	.3	1.0	1.0	3.1	2.3	2.3	1.1
7	-	-	-	1.0	.8	1.8	3.4	6.0	4.7	4.0
8	-	-	-	.1	.6	.6	1.8	5.8	6.8	2.6
9	-	-	.3	.1	.3	.1	1.6	3.4	6.6	13.0

0 Variance = 31.6% +1, 0, -1 Variance = 63.6% +2 to -2 Variance = 83.6%
N of Pairs = (53)(12) = 636 Possible Pairs

Required Proficiency - Pilot Phase Two (30 Items)

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	.1	-	*	.1	*	-	.1	.1
2	-	.1@	.1	*	.1	*	.3	.1	*	*
3	-	*	.2	.1	.2	.4	.7	1.0	.6	.4
4	-	-	*	*	.5	.6	1.0	.8	.3	.1
5	-	-	*	.6	.7	1.9	1.7	2.1	1.3	1.3
6	-	*	*	.3	.8	1.4	3.7	4.3	3.9	1.1
7	-	-	.1	.2	.3	1.7	2.9	7.9	6.0	3.8
8	-	*	*	*	.4	.8	1.5	5.7	8.3	3.7
9	-	-	-	*	-	.7	1.8	3.1	5.7	10.4

0 Variance = 33% +1, 0, -1 Variance = 66.3% +2 to -2 Variance = 85%
N of Pairs = (53)(30) = 1590 Possible Pairs

Present Proficiency-Pilot Phase Two (30 Items)

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	2@	.1	*	.1	*	*	-	-	-
2	-	.1	.1	.3	*	.3	.3	.3	-	-
3	-	*	.3	.9	.6	.6	.8	.3	.5	.1
4	-	-	.2	.6	.8	1.6	.8	.9	.2	-
5	-	-	.2	.6	.9	2.7	2.8	1.5	.5	*
6	-	*	.1	.5	1.0	2.6	5.1	4.6	2.6	1.4
7	-	*	-	.3	.8	1.5	4.6	7.9	6.4	1.2
8	-	-	-	*	.5	1.0	2.5	8.7	8.1	3.7
9	-	*	-	*	-	*	1.4	2.5	4.0	6.1

0 Variance = 31.9% +1, 0, -1 Variance = 73.8% +2 to -2 Variance = 88.8%
 N of Pairs = (53)(30) = 1590 Possible Pairs

@ = All numbers within the Tables are cell percentages of the total number of paired responses

* = less than .5%.

Table 8
 Selected Data for MCMI Individual Items:
 Items Grouped by Management Function and Effectiveness Characteristic

		Median Required	Median Required	Percent W/ Need 1 or More	Percent W/Need 2 or More
<u>External Awareness</u>					
54.	Keep up-to-date with objectives and activities of the court.	7.1	7.2	34	14
55.	Keep up-to-date with court politics.	6.9	6.9	35	18
56.	Keep up-to-date with political developments/trends outside the court that may affect work unit.	6.2	6.2	35	19
57.	Keep up-to-date with socio-economic developments/trends that may affect work unit.	5.6	5.8	34	15

58.	Keep up-to-date with developments in your technical area of expertise (e.g., social work, law, budgeting, etc.)	7.1	5.8	43	20
59.	Keep up-to-date with technological changes that may affect work unit.	6.6	6.2	42	24
60.	Keep up-to-date with Michigan Supreme Court priorities and rules.	7.2	6.7	44	25
61.	Apply an understanding of roles, operations and relationships of the Court and local units of government.	6.5	6.4	37	18
124.	Monitor proposed changes in state legislation that may affect the court or the work unit.	5.8	5.2	35	20

Interpretation

43.	Explain/clarify broad court policies and priorities to subordinates.	6.9	7.0	31	15
44.	Keep subordinates informed about external issues (political, economic, interest groups, etc.) that impact their work.	5.6	6.1	28	13
45.	Extract and apply information pertinent to work unit from higher management directives.	6.9	7.0	32	15
46.	Prepare letters, memos, or reports that require little modification by higher management.	7.3	7.7	27	10
47.	See that work unit activities/products reflect higher management directives/policies.	7.1	7.3	27	11

Representation

48.	Represent/promote work unit before groups and individuals within the court.	6.4	6.8	29	15
49.	Represent/promote court before groups and individuals outside court.	6.4	6.5	31	17
50.	Explain work unit programs and functions to nonexperts in terms they can understand.	6.8	7.1	27	14
51.	Persuade individuals outside the court to "buy into" a desired course of action.	5.8	5.6	35	22
52.	Use informal networks and procedures to help achieve objectives or resolve conflicts.	6.6	5.4	35	20
53.	Respond to inquiries and requests from outside work unit.	6.6	7.2	25	11
117.	Negotiate personally or help to set the parameters for negotiation of court collective bargaining agreements.	2.7	2.7	31	22
125.	Actively work to keep the general public informed about the court and about the needs of the court or of the work unit.	5.0	4.8	32	20

Coordination

62.	Maintain productive working relationships with other agencies of government.	6.7	6.8	31	15
63.	Maintain productive working relationships with clientele groups.	6.6	5.8	32	15
64.	Maintain productive working relationships with various city or county elected officials.	6.4	6.4	36	21

65.	Maintain productive working relationships with other work units in the court.	7.2	7.3	30	11
66.	Get cooperation and action from those <u>not</u> under your direct control.	7.0	7.1	31	15
67.	Keep higher level management informed of work unit developments in a timely manner.	7.0	7.3	25	11
130.	Coordinate with technical staff on the uses of automated information systems in the work unit.	5.9	4.7	40	27

Work Unit Planning

1.	Develop and adjust long-term work-unit goals as necessary.	5.8	6.1	34	16
2.	Establish a balance among competing objectives to accomplish overall court goals.	6.1	6.2	34	17
3.	Develop alternative strategies for accomplishing work unit goals.	6.3	6.6	31	15
4.	Assess the political feasibility of alternative courses of action.	5.3	5.4	35	20
5.	Assess the financial feasibility of alternative courses of action.	5.8	5.6	39	20
6.	Assess the technical feasibility of alternative courses of action.	6.2	5.8	44	25
7.	Anticipate obstacles to achieving work-unit goals and identify means to overcome them.	6.8	6.5	42	20
8.	Maintain a balance between needs/ goals of specialized interests and court missions.	6.2	6.2	37	17

123.	Plan and analyze the costs of new programs or alterations to existing programs of the work unit.	5.0	4.4	32	20
------	--	-----	-----	----	----

Work Unit Guidance

8.	Maintain a balance between needs/ goals of specialized interests and court missions.	6.2	6.2	37	17
9.	Identify specific projects and actions needed to accomplish work unit goals.	6.5	6.7	30	15
10.	Establish priorities among competing projects.	6.5	6.9	27	13
11.	Set challenging but realistic deadlines for completing work unit goals.	6.2	6.7	27	13
12.	Schedule work to maximize the efficient use of available resources.	6.7	6.9	33	16
13.	Take long-term goals into account while devising short-term plans/schedules.	6.4	6.4	38	17
14.	Provide specific guidance on how goal accomplishmen is to be measured.	6.2	5.7	44	26

Budgeting

15.	Prepare or provide input into the work unit's annual budget request.	5.6	4.5	47	30
16.	Project long-term financial resource requirements of work unit.	5.0	3.9	43	28
17.	Explain and justify work unit budget requests orally or in writing.	5.5	5.1	38	24

18.	Apply an understanding of the budget review and justification process in interacting with city, county, or state budget units.	4.7	4.2	36	24
19.	Apply financial accounting reports and mechanisms in managing the work unit.	4.8	4.3	36	22
120.	Forecast revenues for the court or the work unit.	3.5	3.4	21	18
121.	Forecast costs of court or work-unit programs and services.	4.7	4.1	32	21
122.	Justify the work-unit's budget request to city or county budget analysts, or during budget hearings.	4.8	4.3	29	18
123.	Plan and analyze the costs of new programs or alterations to existing programs of the work unit.	5.0	4.4	32	20
128.	Propose ways of cutting costs or set priorities for making budget cuts.	5.6	5.1	35	18

Material Resources Admin.

20.	Plan the acquisition of equipment, facilities, supplies or services.	5.2	5.4	32	19
21.	Apply contract and procurement rules and regulations in managing work unit.	5.1	5.1	34	21
22.	Oversee or participate in managing procurement of key material resources (supplies, equipment, telecommunications, etc.).	5.1	5.4	31	16
23.	Oversee or participate in managing contractor activities.	3.3	3.8	28	16

24.	Oversee or participate in managing logistical operations.	4.6	4.6	34	20
129.	Implement automated information systems in the court.	5.6	4.2	40	27

Personnel Management

25.	Plan for needed changes in the size or composition of work unit staff.	5.9	5.9	36	17
26.	Take an active role in recruiting and retaining staff for work unit.	6.3	6.4	36	21
27.	Apply an understanding of court, city, county personnel rules/regulations on selection and promotion.	6.2	6.1	30	24
28.	Use personnel management practices that promote good labor-management relations.	6.5	6.4	40	23
29.	Use personnel management practices that support equal employment opportunity.	5.8	6.2	32	16
30.	Develop performance standards and conduct performance appraisals.	6.5	6.0	43	25
31.	Take corrective or disciplinary actions with subordinates as necessary.	6.8	6.2	46	28
116.	Conduct grievance investigation and write responses to grievances.	5.5	4.9	40	26
117.	Negotiate personally or help to set the parameters for negotiation of court collective bargaining agreements.	2.7	2.7	31	22

118.	Evaluate jobs in terms of their worth for purposes of determining levels of pay.	4.9	4.6	33	21
126.	Hire new employees.	5.7	5.6	19	16
127.	Fire or lay off employees.	5.3	4.1	36	26

Supervision

32.	Make daily work assignments to subordinates.	5.3	6.6	20	11
33.	Give subordinates authority to commensurate with delegated responsibilities.	6.3	6.9	24	11
34.	Use participative management techniques in dealing with subordinates.	6.7	6.7	32	18
35.	Explain task expectations so that each subordinate clearly understands his/her role.	7.0	7.0	34	17
36.	Recognize and reward employees for significant achievements.	6.5	6.7	32	19
37.	Help subordinates identify their developmental needs and means for meeting them.	6.5	6.2	38	20
38.	Coach and counsel employees on a variety of matters.	6.7	6.7	33	14
39.	Actively promote cooperation and teamwork within work unit.	7.3	7.3	35	17
40.	Quickly recognize when subordinates are having difficulties performing work.	7.0	6.9	37	20
41.	Maintain a balance between concern for people and concern for productivity.	6.9	7.1	38	20
42.	Assist subordinates in resolving technical problems.	6.9	7.0	32	14

Work Unit Monitoring

68.	Adjust to changes in workload, resources, or priorities in a timely manner.	7.2	7.3	31	14
69.	Set up and use formal systems for monitoring work progress.	6.2	6.0	38	23
70.	Use direct observation or informal contacts in monitoring work progress.	6.5	6.7	30	14
71.	Reallocate resources as necessary.	6.3	6.5	31	17
72.	Identify irregularities in work unit operations before major problems arise.	7.2	6.9	42	24
119.	Maintain a plan and procedures for the security of the court, court employees, court records and contents, and those coming in contact with the court.	5.5	5.1	35	21
124.	Monitor proposed changes in state legislation that may affect the court or the work unit.	5.8	5.2	35	20
131.	Oversee or participate in managing caseload activities in the work unit.	6.7	6.8	32	15
132.	Oversee or participate in managing jury activities in the work unit.	3.1	3.0	20	12

Program Evaluation

73.	Critically and realistically assess the overall effectiveness of the work unit.	7.3	6.8	43	24
74.	Identify ways for improving the cost effectiveness of work-unit operations.	6.3	5.8	41	27

75.	Identify ways for improving work-unit procedures, processes, or structure.	7.1	6.8	39	22
76.	Assess progress toward achieving long-term work unit goals.	6.6	6.4	39	22
77.	Use information from formal program evaluations to assess and improve work unit operations.	6.4	6.0	40	22
128.	Propose ways of cutting costs or set priorities for making budget cuts.	5.6	5.1	35	18

Broad Perspective

13.	Take long-term goals into account while devising short-term plans/schedules.	6.4	6.4	38	17
98.	Take a "big picture" view of issues and situations.	8.3	7.2	39	18
101.	Maintain a sense of mission in day-to-day activities.	7.1	7.0	34	17

Strategic View

52.	Use informal networks and procedures to help achieve objectives or resolve conflicts.	6.6	5.4	35	20
99.	Identify recurrent patterns in events or data.	6.9	6.9	34	19
104.	Recognize discrepancies, deficiencies, and inconsistencies in various types of information.	7.1	6.8	41	23
105.	Recognize the essential elements of a problem in a timely manner.	7.3	6.8	48	22

106.	Apply systematic problem solving techniques in determining the most appropriate course of action.	6.8	6.6	40	22
109.	Use output from quantitative data analysis in decision making.	6.1	6.1	35	19
111.	Gather information for decision making through informal inquiry and discussion.	6.8	7.0	27	12
114.	Know when to take action and when to "bide time".	7.5	7.0	41	21
115.	Recognize and take advantage of opportunities to further goals and objectives.	7.0	6.8	39	19
117.	Negotiate personally or help to set the parameters for negotiation of court collective bargaining agreements.	2.7	2.7	31	22

Environmental Sensitivity

4.	Assess the political feasibility of alternative courses of action.	5.3	5.4	35	20
8.	Maintain a balance between needs/goals of specialized interests and court missions.	6.2	6.2	37	17
98.	Take a "big picture" view of issues and situations.	8.3	7.2	39	18
107.	Consider the ethical implication of a given course of action.	6.7	7.0	30	17
114.	Know when to take action and when to "bide time".	7.5	7.0	41	21

Leadership

32.	Make daily work assignments to subordinates.	5.3	6.6	20	11
-----	--	-----	-----	----	----

35.	Explain task expectations so that each subordinate clearly understands his/her role.	7.0	7.0	34	17
39.	Actively promote cooperation and teamwork within work unit.	7.3	7.3	35	17
78.	Conduct briefings and other meetings in a way that achieves direct objectives.	6.7	6.3	40	23
112.	Attain objectives without overt use of power or authority.	7.3	7.1	37	17
113.	Make "tough" or unpopular decisions.	7.4	6.9	39	22

Flexibility

92.	Handle job pressures and stress.	8.3	7.5	42	24
97.	Shift attention to a variety of problems throughout the day.	8.0	7.8	34	14
100.	Manage work unit within a context of ambiguous directives and objectives from higher management.	7.1	6.9	37	19
102.	Adjust management style to fit different situations and people.	7.2	7.0	37	19
110.	Generate and/or recognize creative or imaginative solutions to work-related situations.	6.9	6.7	38	19

Action Orientation

90.	Initiate action rather than waiting to react to situations as they develop.	7.3	7.0	44	23
91.	Act decisively on own authority when timely action is needed.	8.0	7.6	36	15

93.	Take calculated risks and accept personal responsibility for their success or failure.	7.7	7.4	37	17
95.	Manage own time efficiently.	7.7	7.1	45	26
108.	Take the initiative in gathering information about key issues.	6.8	6.9	32	13
115.	Recognize and take advantage of opportunities to further goals and objectives.	7.0	6.8	39	19

Results Focus

76.	Assess progress toward achieving long-term work unit goals.	6.6	6.4	39	22
89.	Work persistently toward a goal despite opposition, distractions and setbacks.	7.3	7.0	42	21
96.	Maintain a high level of mental activity for prolonged periods of time.	7.5	7.2	38	18
101.	Maintain a sense of mission in day-to-day activities.	7.1	7.0	34	17
116.	Conduct grievance investigation and write responses to grievances.	5.5	4.9	40	26

Communication

79.	Present ideas clearly and persuasively in oral presentations.	7.2	6.7	43	25
80.	Present ideas clearly and persuasively in writing.	7.4	7.0	40	23
81.	Listen to others and show understanding or what they are saying.	7.6	7.5	35	16

Interpersonal Sensitivity

51.	Persuade individuals outside the court to "buy into" a desired course of action.	5.8	5.6	35	22
82.	Provide positive feedback in a manner that reinforces desirable behavior.	7.3	7.1	40	22
83.	Provide negative feedback in a constructive manner.	7.4	6.6	50	30
84.	Accurately assess the capabilities, limitations, and needs of others.	7.4	6.8	47	27
85.	Resolve conflict situations through informal discussions or counseling.	7.2	6.8	44	25
86.	Realistically assess own strength, weaknesses, and impact on others.	7.5	6.7	53	32
87.	Make favorable first impression in a variety of settings.	7.1	6.9	40	21
88.	Accept and make productive use of criticism.	7.2	6.7	48	26
103.	Resolve conflicts or differences of opinion among judges in your court about how the court or the work unit should function.	5.9	4.9	42	28
117.	Negotiate personally or help to set the parameters for negotiation of court collective bargaining agreements.	2.7	2.7	31	22

Technical Competence

6.	Assess the technical feasibility of alternative courses of action.	6.2	5.8	44	25
----	--	-----	-----	----	----

42.	Assist subordinates in resolving technical problems.	6.9	7.0	32	14
58.	Keep up-to-date with developments in your technical area of expertise (e.g., social work, law, budgeting, etc.).	7.1	5.8	43	20

PART II: THE MCMI - TRAINING IMPLICATIONS

Before exploring the training implications suggested by the MCMI, it is useful to reiterate and summarize what the MCMI has produced with respect to administrative employees in the Michigan trial courts:

- Priorities in twenty-two general management areas--twelve management functions (the "what" of management) and ten effectiveness characteristics (the "how" of management);
- Priorities with respect to 132 general tasks areas (which are components of the twenty-two general management areas);
- The number and percentage of respondents indicating needs and strengths in all of the areas described above, and;
- The relative priorities, needs, and strengths by major job group, court type, managerial level, court size, and other demographic variables.

The focus of the MCMI is on managerial issues rather than court-specific, technical issues. Therefore, as will be discussed in more detail below, the need still exists to apply the findings more specifically to the Michigan court setting.

Overview

As the analysis discussed thus far has indicated, the training implications and options for MJJ as a result of the MCMI findings are wide and varied. In addition, practical, philosophical, and political issues will certainly also impact on training design and participant selection. Among the options for training design and participant selection, the following warrant some introductory comments, to be followed in subsequent sections with specific recommendations:

- By Court Type - As discussed, above MCMI results do not indicate significant differences in training needs or priorities by court type. However, it is often true that new issues warrant specialized programs for managerial employees in certain courts, e.g., OUIL training for District Court Administrators or special seminars for probate registers. When such situations arise and programs are presented, it might be expedient for MJJ to include high priority training items were applicable from the MCMI.
- By Managerial Level - This is perhaps the most significant demographic variable affecting training design, and it will be discussed in more detail below.
- By Court - For the larger courts, i.e., those with enough supervisors and managers with similar needs, it might be cost effective to develop programs

specifically for those courts. Alternatively, MJJI can present these courts with data about their identified needs and priorities, allowing the courts to fund necessary training programs themselves, either through internal court funds or perhaps through grant funds from the Michigan Justice Training Act.

- By Training Needs - Given the limited variation in need by court type (see Table 5), a second especially useful method for the design of courses and selection of participants is to do so by training need. High need items will be discussed below along with some suggested groupings into programs and the rationale for such groupings.
- By Combination of the Above Factors - It is also possible to examine combinations of the above factors if such combinations would lead to large enough need groups to make cost efficient training feasible. However, as will be discussed below, given MJJI resources it does not appear likely that such efforts would be time well spent in light of other activities and options.

Findings Revisited and Their Training Implications

The specific findings of the MCMI survey that have the most significant and direct implications for training design and presentation are as follows:

Managerial Level

The most useful configuration for considering the design and development of training programs using MCMI results arises from an examination of managerial level. Survey results clearly suggest that top management (defined as court administrators, deputy or assistant administrators, and divisional or bureau heads) have distinct training needs (see Table 4). Second, because of the dynamic nature of all organizations, except for those organizations experiencing retrenchment, there are always cadres of new supervisors and managers. While the size of the cadre will fluctuate as a function of growth, attrition, and turnover, since there is no evidence that the Michigan trial courts are experiencing or expecting a period of retrenchment, this cadre exists (11.8% of respondents indicated that they had been in their present position for less than one year), and can be expected to continue to exist. Finally, by deduction, there remains a residual group of managers, who are neither new to management nor are at the top of the court hierarchy. Included are middle managers in the larger courts and administrative specialists.

Suggested training topics for each of these three groups are listed below, with explanation in the sections following:

TOP MANAGERS

Interpersonal Sensitivity
 Program Evaluation
 Strategic View
 Personnel Management
 Budgeting

NEW MANAGERS

Management Functions and Effectiveness
 Characteristics in general and in the Michigan Courts
 Interpersonal Sensitivity
 Supportive Communication
 Dealing with Problem Employees

OTHER MANAGERS

Interpersonal Sensitivity
 Materials Resources Administration
 Work Unit Monitoring
 Program Evaluation
 Dealing with Problem Employees

Top Managers: The demographic group with the clearest distinction in training needs and priorities is composed of those identified as top managers (court administrators, deputy or assistant administrators, and divisional or bureau heads). Before exploring these needs, there are other factors which might affect a decision to single this group out for training. First, by initially training top administrators MJJ may be able to have a greater impact on improvements in court effectiveness and efficiency since presumably the top administrator's new skills and increased knowledge would impact on all aspects of the court's operations. Second, the top administrators, having seen the value of training based upon MCMI results, might be more enthusiastic about sending their people to MJJ/MCMI programs paying closer attention to encourage key people to attend. Third, top managers trained in an MCMI-based program might be more inclined to initiate and/or fund necessary efforts for the other supervisors and managers within their courts. Finally, top administrators, particularly from the larger courts are the cadre of trained managers who have been through MJJ, Institute for Court Management, and other similar programs, leading to the thought process which culminated in the MCMI development and administration. By focusing a program around their needs MJJ might be better able to again influence those key individuals in the Michigan court administration network.

The topics for such a program should focus on those top priority items identified in this survey (see Tables 2 and 4):

- **Interpersonal Sensitivity:** Having self-knowledge and awareness of ones impact on others; sensitivity to the needs, strengths, and weaknesses of others; having facility for negotiation, conflict resolution, and persuasion.
- **Program Evaluation:** Critically assessing the degree to which court and program/project goals are achieved and the overall effectiveness/efficiency of work-unit operations, to identify means for improving work-unit performance.
- **Strategic View:** Collecting, assessing, and analyzing information for diagnosis, anticipation, judgment.
- **Personnel Management:** Projecting the number and types of staff needed by the work unit, interacting with labor unions, and using various personnel management components (e.g., recruitment, selection, promotion, performance, appraisal) in managing the court or the work unit.
- **Budgeting:** Preparing, justifying and/or administering the budget of the court or the work unit.

The material provided in each of those sections should reflect two concerns. First, items of greatest needs for top administrators on the MCMI must be examined. A content analysis of relevant MCMI items by program planning committees and faculty should by necessity be involved to help to increase specificity to the Michigan court setting. Second, "cutting edge" issues, i.e., issues having significance and timeliness for top managers in the court, must be included with practical applications that can be utilized in their courts. Because top managers, perhaps more than any other group, are likely to perceive themselves as "too busy" to attend training, it is imperative that practical applications contemporary issues be stressed.

Perhaps two of the priority functions and effectiveness characteristics warrant more detailed discussion here. Interpersonal sensitivity is clearly a major item of importance across managerial levels. While skill-building in this area is essential, perhaps the necessary prerequisite for such is a thorough self analysis by each participant of his/her leadership style, communication pattern, etc. Knowing where one is, along with the implications of that present position, are probably necessary for successful movements to a more effective position (see item 88, table 7). And because of the effect of the top manager's perceived style of interpersonal sensitivity on the organization as a whole, increased MJI investments in this area for this group seem worthy of examination.

A second area, program evaluation, is a clear signal of the importance of research (evaluation) skills for people at the top of the organization. Three key questions that such a module should equip participants to answer are: (1) Where are we organizationally, (2) How did we get here, and (3) What are the implications for this in terms of predicting if not controlling our future? These are not the kind of questions that should be talked about in the abstract, but rather participants should

be made to apply the skills around which these questions are focused to major problems that they face within their courts.

New and First Line Managers: The analysis has not yielded significant findings on differences and needs at levels other than top management. Nevertheless, as suggested above, there is a core of new supervisors (and untrained first line supervisors) in need of the kind of skill building program that MJI can provide. It is well documented in the literature and in organizational experience that it is important to begin new managers on the right foot, to begin their managerial experience on the positive. It is usually easier and more effective to create appropriate skills than it is to redirect poor ones. This would seem to suggest some logic for a regularly scheduled basic supervision program from MJI. The authors suggest the following topics:

- The roles, functions, and effectiveness characteristics of supervisors and managers in the Michigan court system, including MCMI research findings.
- Interpersonal sensitivity - Having self-knowledge and awareness of one's impact on others; sensitivity to the needs strengths, and weaknesses of others; having facility for negotiation, conflict resolution, and persuasion.
- Supportive communication - Sending and receiving communication, selecting appropriate media, the role of perception, communications barriers.
- Dealing with problem employees - Analyzing and solving performance and behavior problems, corrective actions, counseling/coaching, constructive criticism, corrective discipline, documentation.

Other Managers: As described above, there is a cadre of managers within the Michigan court system beyond the introductory level, who are neither at the top administrative level nor in the larger, more complex, more demanding courts. This middle group similarly has training needs. MCMI results suggest that the major topics which should be included for such an audience are:

- Interpersonal sensitivity: Having self-knowledge and awareness of ones impact on others; sensitivity to the needs, strengths, and weaknesses of others; having facility for negotiation, conflict resolution, and persuasion.
- Material resources administration: Assuring the availability of adequate supplies, equipment, facilities; overseeing procurement/contracting activities, and/or overseeing logistical operations.
- Work unit monitoring: Keeping up-to-date on the overall status of activities in the court or the work unit, identifying problem areas, and taking corrective actions (e.g., rescheduling, reallocating resources, etc.).

- Program evaluation: Critically assessing the degree to which court and program/project goals are achieved and the overall effectiveness/efficiency of work-unit operations, to identify means for improving work-unit performance.
- Dealing with problem employees: Analyzing and solving performance and behavior problems, corrective actions, counseling/coaching, constructive criticism, corrective discipline, documentation.

The program developed by MJI using MCMI results in the fall of 1985 might serve as an effective model for such a program. That program was developed by identifying top managers with high needs in two or more of five management functions and effectiveness characteristics selected because of their importance as well as the expertise of the predetermined faculty who would be developing and presenting the program. A general theme of managing problems and goals was determined and implications explored in the following areas:

- Interpersonal sensitivity and supportive communication,
- Budgeting,
- Forecasting,
- Program evaluation,
- Employee performance evaluation, and
- Corrective actions and grievance handling.

It should be noted, however, that sound program design would suggest limiting these topics in any one program and/or increasing the time devoted to their coverage.

Major Training Needs

A second major method by which MJI can develop training programs is to examine those key issues for which there was a high importance and a large need gap. As listed earlier in Table 4, the following are the items for which at least 60 respondents met the criteria of: (1) indicating a required proficiency in their jobs of at least six and (2) also had a need gap of at least three. (Note: The level of sixty was selected because the authors believed that sixty would provide enough participants for two or more program offerings, allowing for the spreading of development costs.) Below is the ranking of items by these criteria:

129. Implement automated information systems in the court
127. Fire or layoff employees
103. Resolve conflict of differences of opinion among judges in your court above how the court or work unit should function

- 130. Coordinate with technical staff on the uses of automated information systems in the work unit
- 31. Take corrective and disciplinary actions with subordinates as necessary
- 83. Provide negative feedback in a constructive manner
- 15. Prepare the work units annual budget request
- 60. Keep up-to-date with Michigan Supreme Court priorities and rules
- 116. Conduct grievance investigations and write responses to grievances
- 117. Negotiate personally or to help set the parameters for negotiations of court collective bargaining agreements
- 95. Manage own time efficiently
- 30. Develop performance standards and conduct performance appraisals
- 79. Present ideas clearly and persuasively in oral presentations
- 113. Make tough or unpopular decisions.
- 86. Realistically assess own strengths, weaknesses, and impact on others
- 104. Recognize discrepancies, deficiencies, and inconsistencies in various types of information
- 18. Apply an understanding of the budget review and justification process interacting with city, county, or state budget units
- 92. Handle job pressures and stress
- 16. Project long term financial resource requirements of work unit
- 118. Evaluate jobs in terms of their worth for purposes of determining levels of pay
- 84. Accurately assess the capabilities, limitations and needs of others
- 123. Plan and analyze the cost of new programs or alterations to existing programs or of the work unit

These items when viewed in conjunction with others that fell slightly below the arbitrary cutoff of 60 respondents suggest training in a few clearly identified seminar topic areas:

- Automated Information Systems in the Court - Because only two items examined automated information systems, it is impossible to detail what should be included in a course along those lines. It is clear, however, that a perceived need exists for respondents to "get on top of" the technology explosion within the courts. The findings suggest that some program in this area should be a feature of the MJJ array of courses for the immediate future.
- Employee Relations - Dealing with employees in areas of discipline, discharge, grievance investigations, and grievance handling form a core program. Skill-building and practical exercises using fictionalized versions of real scenarios offer a great possibility for a well received program.
- Fiscal Management - Survey results seem to indicate a strong need for MJJ to continue to offer programs in the budgeting area. Budget preparation, presentation, interactions with the funding unit and prioritization must continue to be covered.
- Personal Awareness/Improvement - A number of the high need training areas might be considered together under a rubrick that says we must first look at ourselves and learn to manage ourselves effectively before we can effectively manage others. Included in this heading would be time management, realistically assessing one's own strengths and weaknesses, being able to handle job pressures and stress, and the ability to accept and make productive use of criticism. There are a number of assessment tools available to help in this process.
- Communication/Conflict Resolution - Effectiveness in oral and written communication probably runs through a number of areas and issues in addition to those specifically identified by MCMI results as communications. Issues of constructive criticism, giving praise, and managing differences between individuals seem to fit together in another skill-building package.
- Performance Appraisal - Related to the employee relations topics and communication topics there is a clear call for programs on developing performance standards and conducting performance appraisal sessions. Such a program might look at the alternatives that are available in performance appraisal, how performance appraisal relates to evaluation more generally, and conducting effective performance appraisal sessions.
- Collective Bargaining - Survey results indicate that a number of participants (70) have strong needs with respect to the collective bargaining process. Collective bargaining is a highly technical area, and one that warrants training with practice in handling the bargaining experience.
- Managing Goals and Problems - A number of items with high needs have to do with determining goals, assessing and revising goals, and handling

problems that arise in managing the courts. A goal oriented approach to problem solving can be effectively presented in a skill-building practical experience, an expansion of a module presented in the two previous MCMI based seminars.

Methods of Participant Selection

With MCMI results it is possible to direct participants into the training programs that best meet their needs. However, the MCMI is a static instrument, i.e., it measured needs at the point at which it was taken, and those needs may have changed. Hence, its use is probably more appropriate in selecting topics for programs, since aggregate results can be expected to be less time sensitive than are individual response patterns. Also, as described above, there were no uniform patterns of relationships evident in the demographic variables that were examined. Therefore, self selection appears the most logical basis for participant selection, when coupled with screening by MJI staff and perhaps, a program committee, who serve as a final check for the proper fit between participant needs and background and the program's objectives.

Training Implications and Final Thoughts

As discussed at many points of this report, numerous options are available and questions must be answered by MJI with respect to the design and presentation of future management training programs. Nevertheless, the authors will at this point take editorial liberty to make some suggestions based upon our experiences as much as our analysis of the MCMI data. First, cost efficiency aside, focusing on the development of one or two key skills seems like a course of action worthy of serious consideration. This might mean that programs are of one or two days duration focusing on some single issue, e.g., performance appraisal, or budget presentations. Those short sessions would be intense with a heavy use of practical activities and applications, e.g., video-taped roleplays that are reviewed and critiqued, written exercises that are reviewed and critiqued. It might be possible to group similar short programs together, requiring participants to attend both or allowing participants to attend one but not the other. Such a configuration might increase scheduling complexity, but the potential advantage of targeting programs for those in need and focusing on a limited, manageable set of needs may be where the chances of positive change in behavior can be maximized.

For the top management group identified earlier as the demographic group with most significant differences, a different delivery method seems in order. To develop the kind of evaluation skills that are critical for those at this top level within the courts, the typical three or four day seminar is probably not a well-suited vehicle. Hands on applications are needed in which skills presented at a program are integrated into the work environment. This suggests a series of short courses over a period of time with projects/activities related to ongoing duties and issues performed by participants and critiqued by faculty between the regularly scheduled sessions. Such a configuration would seem to maximize behavioral change and performance

improvement and would also seem to meet with the scheduling difficulties of this group. Regularly spaced shorter programs would seem more easily attended than infrequent longer programs.

Final Recommendations For MJI Consideration

A few final issues should be considered by MJI with respect to the MCMI.

- Having invested in the development of the MCMI, MJI should plan to readminister it at regular intervals, perhaps every three to five years. This type of time series analysis will permit MJI to determine the reliability of the instrument over longer periods of time and to further evaluate the effectiveness of the training efforts based upon present MCMI findings.
- For new people entering management positions within the court system, MJI should consider administering the MCMI and scoring it using Michigan State University facilities. A summary of MCMI findings could be developed for use by the respondent in self-analyzing the results provided.
- MJI should ensure that the major court management associations are aware of MCMI results and the capacity for analyzing results along lines that they would find useful so long as (1) confidentiality is not violated, and (2) the association picks up costs incurred.

Finally, MJI should continue to be observant for other job analytic instruments which might provide more specific, task-oriented information for some or all managerial jobs within the courts. The authors are unaware at present of any such instrument that would yield the kind of data we believe MJI is seeking, but one may be on the horizon.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Carbon, Susan and Larry Berkson (1978) Literature on Court Unification: Annotated Bibliography. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.
- Cascio, Wayne (1978) Applied Psychology in Personnel Management. Reston, Virginia: Reston Publishing Co.
- Cornelius III., Edwin T. and Karen S. Lyness (1980) "A Comparison of Holistic and Decomposed Judgment Strategies In Job Analyses by Job Incumbents," 65 Journal of Applied Psychology 2:155-163.
- Fine, S.A. and Wretha A. Wiley (1971) An Introduction to Functional Job Analysis: A Scaling of Selected Tasks from the Social Welfare Field. Kalamazoo, Michigan: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.
- Flanders, Loretta R. and Dennis Utterback (1985) "The Management Excellence Inventory: A Tool For Management Development," Public Administration Review (May/June) 403-414.
- Hudzik, John K. (1984) Federal Aid to Criminal Justice: Rhetoric, Results, Lessons. Washington, D.C.: National Criminal Justice Association.
- McCormick, E.J., et al. (1972) Technical Manual for the Position Analysis Questionnaire (PAQ). West Lafayette, Ind.: PAQ Services.
- Meyer, Bernadine (1971) "Court Administration: The Newest Profession." Duquesne Law Review. 10 (Winter), 220-235.
- National Criminal Justice Reference Service (1978) Police Job-Task Analysis: An Overview. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. Also, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Proceedings of the National Symposium of Job-Task Analysis in Criminal Justice. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Saari, David J. (1982). American Court Management: Theories and Practices. Westport, Connecticut: Quorum Books.
- Sistrunk, Frank, et al. (1980) Methods for Human Resources in the Criminal Justice System: A Feasibility Study. Tampa, Florida: Center for Evaluation Research, Human Resources Institute.
- Stout, Ronald (1986) "Planning for Unified Court Budgeting." 69 Judicature 205-213.